



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,214	11/18/2003	Valerie Kucharewski	06975-444001	2244

26171 7590 04/20/2007
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

HOSSAIN, IBRAHIM M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2145

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

ED

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/715,214	Applicant(s) KUCHAREWSKI ET AL.	
	Examiner Ibrahim Hossain	Art Unit 2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>05/27/2004 and 09/07/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-3, 5-18, and 20-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, because the claim does not produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, claim 29 refers to "a computer readable medium" as described "storage medium" "propagated signal" in the specification (paragraph 0032) can include to a modulated data signal.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2145

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11, 15-18,21-22,and 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates et al. (6,247,043) in view of Stimmel (6,678,719)

Regarding claims 1 and 30, Bates teaches a method for enabling management of contacts, the method comprising:

creating a single list of contacts (a contact table, Bates, col.8, lines 7-10) that is stored in a central repository (Master contact database that maintains records, Bates, col.7, lines 26-32);

enabling a member to define a group of contacts (group "java team", Bates, 232, fig.15) from the single list of contacts and represent the group of contacts by a unique identifier (fig.15 (232), setting a "java team" and naming as a unique identifier, Bates, col.4, lines 12-26, col.18, lines 58-col. 19, line14);

enabling the member to address communications (send/receive Message, Bates, 112, fig.11), to the group contacts represented by the unique identifier ("java team" as a unique identifier, Bates, col.4, lines 12-26, col.17, lines 39-67 and col.18, lines 20-27). Bates fails to disclose multiple applications. However, Stimmel, in the same field of endeavor, discloses a member to address communications sent from multiple applications to a single contact presented by the unique identifier (i.e. email, telephone, Instant chat, Stimmel, Fig. 3A, and col. 3, lines 61- col. 4, lines 2).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Stimmel's method to modify in Bates's method. The motivation would have been enable the user to select different application to assign with other user in order to collaborate and more efficiency with one another.

Regarding claim 2, Bates-Stimmel further discloses enabling the member to send a copy of the group of contacts to a recipient (Bates, col. 9, lines 22-30).

Regarding claim 3, Bates-Stimmel further discloses receiving a request from the member or the recipient to modify the group (Bates, col.14, lines 18-42);

updating copies of the group held by the member and the recipient to reflect the requested change (Bates, col.14, lines 18-42 and col. 19, lines 33-57);

Regarding claim 4, Bates-Stimmel further discloses notifying the member and the recipient of the requested change to the group (Bates, col.14, lines 33-67);

Regarding claim 5, Bates- Stimmel further discloses the multiple applications include communications applications (i.e. email, Instant chat, telephone, Stimmel, Fig. 3A, and col. 3, lines 61- col. 4, line 2).

Regarding claim 6, Bates- Stimmel further discloses the communications applications include an e-mail application and at least one application other than an e-

mail application (i.e. email, Instant chat, telephone, Stimmel, Fig. 3A, and col. 3, lines 61- col. 4, lines 2).

Regarding claim 7, Bates- Stimmel further discloses the communications applications include an instant messaging application and at least one application other than an instant messaging application (i.e. email, Instant chat, telephone, Stimmel, Fig. 3A, and col. 3, lines 61- col. 4, lines 2).

Regarding claim 8, Bates- Stimmel further discloses the communications applications include a digital image sharing application and at least one application other than a digital image sharing application (i.e. email, Instant chat, telephone, Video conferencing, Stimmel, Fig. 3A, and col. 3, lines 61- col. 4, lines 2).

Regarding claim 9, Bates- Stimmel further discloses the communications applications include an alerting application that sends alerts and reminders to users and at least one application other than an alerting application that sends alerts and reminders to users (electronic calendars is an alerting application that sends alerts and reminder to the users, Bates, col.1, lines 48-51).

Regarding claim 10, Bates-Stimmel further discloses the communications applications include an application for sharing (Stimmel, sharing information by email,

fig.3, col.3, lines 61-col.4, lines 2) and exchanging contact information and at least one application other than an application for sharing and exchanging contact information (Stimmel, exchanging information by telephone number, fig.3A, col.3, lines 61-col.4, lines 2).

Regarding claim 11, Bates-Stimmel further discloses the multiple applications include other sharing applications (Stimmel, Fig. 3A, and col. 3, lines 61- col. 4, lines 2).

Regarding claim 15, Bates-Stimmel further discloses each of the contacts is listed in the single list of contacts and in the group of contacts by a single identifier (user "Smith, John" represent the group of contacts, fig.15 (232), setting a "java team" and naming as a unique identifier, Bates, col.4, lines 12-26, col.18, lines 20-27);

Regarding claim 16, Bates-Stimmel further discloses the single identifier is an e-mail address (user John is a single identifier an email address, Stimmel, Fig. 3A, and col. 3, lines 61- col. 4, lines 2).

Regarding claim 17, Bates-Stimmel further discloses the single identifier is a screen name (user John is a single identifier a screen name, Stimmel, Fig. 3A, and col. 3, lines 61- col. 4, lines 2).

Regarding claim 18, Bates-Stimmel further discloses the single identifier is a cellular phone number (user John is a single identifier by his phone number, Stimmel, Fig. 3A, and col. 3, lines 61- col. 4, lines 2).

Regarding claim 21, Bates-Stimmel further discloses enable the member to use a graphical user interface to specify contacts from the single list of contacts to be included in the group of contacts (Bates, fig.15, col.4, lines 12-26, col.18, lines 20-27);

Enabling the member to name the group of contacts (Bates, col.4, lines 12-26, col.18, lines 20-27).

Regarding claim 22, Bates-Stimmel further discloses recognizing a set of contacts from the single list as repeated recipients of communications sent by a member (Bates, fig.15, col.4, lines 12-26, col.18, lines 20-27)

enabling the member to define a group containing the set of contacts without actively specifying the set of contacts (Bates, fig.15, col.4, lines 12-26, col.18, lines 20-27).

Regarding claim 24, Bates-Stimmel further discloses communications from multiple applications (Stimmel, col.3, lines 61-col.4, lines 2) are stored and examined (Stimmel, col.4, lines 14-24).

Regarding claim 25, Bates-Stimmel further discloses recognizing a set of contacts from the single list as repeated recipients of communications sent by a member comprises:

storing a predetermined number of communications sent by the member (Bates, Fig.5, storing the number of communication, col.9, lines 36-38 and col.11, lines 37-40);

examining the predetermined number of communications sent by the member (Bates, number of messages sent by the local user to the other users, col.11, lines 40-44 and col. 12, lines 3-8);

identifying a set of contacts that was sent at least a minimum number of communications out of the predetermined number of communications by the member (Bates, col.4, lines 12-26 and col.11, lines 40-44).

Regarding claim 26, Bates-Stimmel further discloses communications from multiple applications (Stimmel, col.3, lines 61-col.4, lines 2) are stored and examined (Stimmel, col.4, lines 14-24).

Regarding claim 27, Bates-Stimmel further discloses enabling the member to define a group containing the set of contacts comprises enabling the member to name the recognized set of contacts (user "Smith, John" represent the group of contacts, fig.15 (232), setting a "java team" and naming as a unique identifier, Bates, col.4, lines 12-26, col.18, lines 20-27).

Regarding claim 28, Bates-Stimmel further discloses wherein permissions and preferences of all contacts (email, telephone, facsimile, instant chat, video conferencing are all electronic messaging system could preferences of all contacts, Stimmel, col.3, lines 64-col.4, lines 2) in the group are the same (Bates, Bates, col.4, lines 12-26, col.18, lines 20-27).

Regarding claim 29, Bates teaches an apparatus comprising a computer readable medium having instructions stored thereon that when executed by a machine result in at least the following:

creating a single list of contacts (a contact table, Bates, col.8, lines 7-10) that is stored in a central repository (Master contact database that maintains records, Bates, col.7, lines 26-32);

enabling a member to define a group of contacts (group "java team", Bates, 232, fig.15) from the single list of contacts and represent the group of contacts by a unique identifier (fig.15 (232), setting a "java team" and naming as a unique identifier, Bates, col.4, lines 12-26, col.18, lines 58-col. 19, line 14)

enabling the member to address communications (send/receive Message, Bates,112, fig.11), to the group contacts represented by the unique identifier ("java team" and naming as a unique identifier, Bates, col.4, lines 12-26, col.17, lines 39-67 and col.18, lines 20-27). Bates fails to disclose multiple applications. However, Stimmel, in the same field of endeavor, discloses a member to address communications sent

Art Unit: 2145

from multiple applications to a single contact presented by the unique identifier (i.e. email, telephone, Instant chat, Stimmel, Fig. 3A, and col. 3, lines 61- col. 4, lines 2).

It would have been obvious to one have ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Stimmel's method to modify in Bates's method. The motivation would have been enable the user to select different application to assign with other user in order to collaborate and more efficiency with one another.

3. Claims 12 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates et al. (6,247,043) in view of Stimmel (6,678,719) as applied to claims 11 and 22 above, and further in view of Kennedy (6,134,582)

Regarding claim 12, Bates-Stimmel further discloses email, telephone, facsimile, instant chat, video conferencing. Bates-Stimmel does not specifically disclose the electronic journal application. However, Kennedy, in the same field of endeavor, discloses the electronic journal application (Kennedy. col.1, lines 25-35 and col.5, lines 21-36)

It would have been obvious to one have ordinary skill in the art will use Kennedy's method to modify in Bates-Stimmel's method. The motivation would have been to allow user to keep in a track of what they are doing in their daily work place and also can transmit that through electronic journal.

Regarding claim 23, Bates-Stimmel discloses storing communication sent by the member (Bates, fig.5, col.9, and lines 36-38); examining the communication sent by the member (Bates, col. 11, lines 40-44); identifying the set of contact that was sent at least a minimum number of communications by the member (Bates, col.4.lines 12-26 and col. 11, lines 40-44). Bates-Stimmel does not specifically disclose a period of time. However, Kennedy, in the same field of endeavor, discloses the period of time (Kennedy, col. 4, lines 9-15).

It would have been obvious to one have ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Kennedy's method to modify in Bates-Stimmel's method. The motivation would have been optimizing communication with electronic message by storing and examining.

4. Claim 13, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates et al. (6,247,043) in view of Stimmel (6,678,719) as applied to claims 11 and 15 above, and further in view of Mousseau et al. (7,096,009)

Regarding claim 13, Bate-Stimmel discloses other sharing application including an e-mail application. Bates-Stimmel fails to disclose sharing applications include an e-mail filtering application and at least one application other than an e-mail filtering application. However Mousseau, in the same field of endeavor, discloses the other sharing applications include an e-mail filtering application and at least one application

other than an e-mail filtering application (saving and indexing incoming and outgoing communication events, Mousseau, fig. 15a, 15b, col.26, line 24-col.27, line 20)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Mousseau's method to modify in Bates-Stimmel's method. The motivation would have been enabling the user to remove spam and viruses from incoming and outgoing email messages.

Regarding claim 19, Bates-Stimmel further discloses enabling the member to address communications sent from multiple applications to the group of contacts represented by the unique identifier comprises:

recognizing a contact that is identified within the group of contacts by a single identifier ("java team" and naming as a unique identifier, Bates, col.4, lines 12-26, col.17, lines 39-67 and col.18, line 20-27) that may not be used to address a message to be sent from a chosen application of the multiple applications (i.e. email, Instant chat, telephone, some contact only able to use e-mail only, Stimmel, Fig. 3A, and col. 3, lines 61- col. 4, line 2) . Bates-Stimmel fails to disclose prompting the member for a different single identifier for the contact that may be used to address the message to be sent from the chosen application, replacing the single identifier with the different single identifier in the group of contacts. However Mousseau, in the same field of endeavor, discloses prompting the member for a different single identifier for the contact that may be used to address the message to be sent from the chosen application, replacing the single identifier with the different single identifier in the group of contacts ("telephone

number or email" as a unique identifier, Mousseau, col.2, line 45-col.3, lines 8 and col.16, line 20-61)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Mousseau's method to modify in Bates-Stimmel's method. The motivation would have been to edit the address book for updates.

Regarding claim 20, Bates-Stimmel further discloses enabling the member to address communications sent from multiple applications to the group of contacts represented by the unique identifier comprises:

recognizing a contact from the group of contacts with a single identifier ("java team" and naming as a unique identifier, Bates, col.4, lines 12-26, col.17, lines 39-67 and col.18, line 20-27) that cannot be used to address a message to be sent from a chosen application of the multiple applications (i.e. email, Instant chat, telephone, Stimmel, Fig. 3A, and col. 3, lines 61- col. 4, line 2). Bates-Stimmel fails to disclose omitting the contact from the group for the purposes of sending communications from the chosen application. However, Mousseau, in the same field of endeavor, discloses omitting the contact from the group for the purposes of sending communications from the chosen application (omitted from the display to further emphasize the select communication events. Furthermore, the type of each select communication event is represented on the viewing screen 1726 in FIG. 15a, for example, by an icon 1727 such as email, SMS, WAP, call, Mousseau, col.26, line 25-57)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Mousseau's method to modify in Bates-Stimmel's method. The motivation would have been to edit the address book for updates.

5. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates et al. (6,247,043) in view of Stimmel (6,678,719) as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Fellenstein et al. (7,032,007)

Regarding **claim 14**, Bates-Stimmel discloses at least one application other than an application that enables the specification of parental controls over a child account (i.e. email, Instant chat, telephone, Stimmel, Fig. 3A, and col. 3, lines 61- col. 4, line 2). Bates-Stimmel does not specifically disclose an application that enables the specification of parental controls over a child account. However, Fellenstein in the same field of endeavor, discloses an application that enables the specification of parental controls over a child account (Fellenstein, col. 6 lines 35-48, Col. 13 lines 20-28)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art will use Fellenstein's method to modify in Bates-Stimmel's method. The motivation would have been to allow parents for controlling over a child account and view the conversation being conducted by their children to make sure that the child is not getting involved with predators looking to exploit the innocence of the child.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sonnenreich et al. U.S. Patent No. (5,974,446), discloses a plurality of different communication techniques for over the internet interfacing between a central server, storing a plurality of different information topics and user identification information.

Deryugin et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,985,943, discloses a network system for managing remote agents of a communication center includes a primary server connected to the network the primary server controlling at least one routing point.

Gershman et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,199,099, discloses a system of manufacture are provided for obtaining information on a mobile computing environment utilizing a distributed communication.

Art Unit: 2145

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ibrahim Hossain whose telephone number is 571-272-9593. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 AM - 5 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571-272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

IH

04/16/2007


JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER